

glaciation of Mount Orford seem to be, 1st, that he did not see any himself; 2nd, that Professor Hitchcock—in short, like Cæsar's untrustworthy lieutenant, reported "*pro viso quod non vidisset*"; 3rd, that the writer, not being a glacialist, would not know what he saw, or be able to reason from it correctly if he did.

To the soft impeachment against himself the writer may be excused from reply. But to the suggestion that Professor Hitchcock reported what he did not see, it is only just to say that Dr. Chalmers omits to mention a very important part of that gentleman's observations. In order to remove any doubt as to the source of the boulders which he found on the higher portions of Mount Orford, Professor Hitchcock submitted a specimen for lithologic determination to Dr. F. D. Adams of McGill University, who found it to be a Laurentian erratic which must have come from the north side of the St. Lawrence river. Yet, Dr. Chalmers makes no reference to this in his criticism of Professor Hitchcock's article. Had he, on the other hand, exercised equal care to inform himself of the character of the loose rock material on the summit of the mountain, Dr. Chalmers doubtless would never have reached his present conclusion. Serpentine from the north-western base of the mountain, slates from the palæozoic rocks beyond, and Laurentian gneiss are so plentiful that any ordinarily careful observer cannot but see them. The soil which supports the scanty timber growth contains a large admixture of drift. A petrographic study of the mountain made by the writer a few years ago did not show a noticeably greater decomposition in surface specimens from the top, than from the base, of the mountain.

Therefore, until Dr. Chalmers has other evidence than he has yet adduced, the writer, while always open to conviction by information, must respectfully decline to accept his present views on the subject.

Yours respectfully,

JOHN A. DRESSER.

St. Henri de Montreal, May 17, 1905.